

*RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE  
AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE REVISION OF THE  
COMPOSITION, RULES AND PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION  
COMMITTEES AND ADVISORY SEARCH COMMITTEES*

15 December 1992

### **Recommendations**

1. That the status quo be maintained with respect to the senior administrative positions which are subject to an appointment by the Board of Governors following a search conducted by an advisory search (or selection) committee established by the Board.
2. That the current Evaluation Committees and Advisory Search Committees be replaced by an Advisory Selection Committee as proposed on page 12 of this report.
3. That the timeframe for the establishment and election of advisory selection committees be as set out on page 13 of this report.
4. That Advisory Selection Committees be composed of nine members.
5. That the composition of Advisory Selection Committees be as proposed on page 15 of this report.
6. That the Advisory Selection Committee be chaired by the senior administrator to whom the position to be filled reports.
7. That a senior administrator, who is called upon to chair such advisory selection committees, chair no more than one committee at a time;
8. That, should two or more advisory selection committees under the jurisdiction of the same person be established at the same time, the other Chair(s) be appointed by the Board of Governors on the recommendation of the Executive Committee.
9. That the University's senior administration be responsible for preparing the profile of the ideal candidate, with the appropriate consultation and input, as outlined in this report. The profile shall be completed within a delay of two months, between April and June.
10. That, in determining the profile, the senior administration solicit input and feedback from the relevant constituencies and from the Executive Committee of the Board of Governors.
11. That, once finalized, the profile of the ideal candidate be forwarded to Senate for its input and recommendations, and then submitted to the Board of Governors for approval.

12. That, after approving the profile of the ideal candidate, the Board of Governors forward the document to the Chair of the advisory selection committee as the basic document on which the said committee is expected to base its deliberations.
13. That members of the advisory selection committee sit as individuals, not as delegates or representatives of any group.
14. That proactive procedures be used to seek out women candidates for senior administrative positions.
15. That, when advertising a position, the qualifications and experience needed for the position be defined in a way that invites and encourages women candidates.
16. That advisory selection committees adopt procedures to avoid even inadvertent discrimination against women.
17. That the election process for faculty members to be recommended as members of advisory selection committees be governed by uniform, University-wide procedures, to be proposed and determined in the way which the Board of Governors will deem to be the most appropriate.
18. That the election process for faculty members be supervised by an independent, impartial authority; and that this authority be the Office of the Secretary-General, provided that sufficient additional resources be allocated to it.
19. That the procedures for the election of administrative and support staff to advisory selection committees be clarified and put in writing.
20. That the administrative and support staff be better informed about the procedures for the election of their representatives on advisory selection committees, through whatever means deemed appropriate by the Department of Human Resources.
21. That the rules and procedures governing the election process provide for eligibility rules applying to all members of the University community.
22. That the requirement for members of evaluation and advisory search committees to sign an undertaking of confidentiality before the start of deliberations be abolished.
23. That there be a presumption in the Rules and Procedures stating that by agreeing to serve on advisory selection committees, members are presumed to undertake to respect the limits of confidentiality set out in the present report, as well as standards of integrity, civility and ethical behaviour.

33. That the reasoned report of the advisory selection committee include a ranking of the candidates on the short list and propose two or three of these candidates by order of preference with a rationale explaining that candidate "A" was favoured over candidates "B" and "C" for reasons relating to the University's overall interest.
34. That the reasoned report of the advisory selection committee must be brought forward to the Board of Governors and considered by the Board in every particular instance, whatever the circumstances may be.
35. That the reasoned report of the advisory selection committee be received by the Board at its following meeting; the report should be considered and dealt with no later than the next regular meeting of the Board of Governors.
36. That in no circumstances should the successful candidate be informed of the outcome of the selection process before the Chair of the Board and the Rector have received a copy of the report and agreed to support the committee's recommendation.
37. That the motion embodying the advisory selection committee's recommendation and seeking the Board's approval be moved by the Rector, and that in moving the resolution, the Rector be given the flexibility of expressing one of two personal options with respect to the committee's recommendation, i.e. either that he or she fully supports it, or that he or she has serious reservations about it.
38. That in cases where the Rector is unable or unwilling to move the motion, he or she so inform the Board and explain his or her position giving the reasons for his or her disagreement.
39. That the conflict resolution mechanism set out at pages 39 and 40, and involving six steps, be adopted and be made a part of the future revised Rules and Procedures;
40. That the advisory selection committee, the concerned academic unit and the entire University community be kept informed, at every stage, of the progress made in attempting to resolve the conflict, and as to how it was ultimately resolved.

24. That in case of a breach of confidentiality, and after due process, there should be an automatic dismissal from the Committee, without a replacement.
25. That, in cases of irregularities or improprieties in the proceedings of an advisory selection committee, any committee member who becomes aware of such irregularities or improprieties be enabled to report them to the Chair of the Board of Governors and solicit his intervention; that the Chair of the Board then investigate the matter with the Chair of the Committee. Should his intervention fail, that an ad hoc committee be established to deal with a formal complaint, in the same way as the current hearing boards operate.
26. That the University's Legal Counsel prepare a Guide Book which will include guidelines on the application of the rules of natural justice as well as the rules and procedures which govern advisory selection committees, and that this Guide Book be distributed to committee members before the first meeting. The Guide Book should also include information on how to avoid inadvertent discrimination against women.
27. That the periodic appraisal of academic units be considered by the advisory selection committee as part of the input to be obtained by the committee and in conjunction with other forms of input.
28. That the short list of candidates be made public within the University community no less than thirty (30) days and no more than sixty (60) days before the advisory selection committee is scheduled to make its recommendation to the Board of Governors.
29. The advisory selection committee may provide an opportunity for the University community to meet informally once with each of the candidates on the short list individually. The purpose of such consultation is to provide an opportunity for dialogue and exchange of views with the candidates.
30. That the Rector be consulted and have the right to give his or her input at any stage of the process.
31. That, prior to the short list being made public, the advisory selection committee inform the Rector of the names of the candidates on the short list and seek his comments and input; and that when the advisory selection committee has agreed on the best candidate and is ready to make its recommendation to the Board, the advisory selection committee should inform the Rector as to its final choice.
32. That the report of the advisory selection committee be reasoned, reflect the committee's conclusions, be signed by all the committee members, and indicate the vote.